arXiv:1401.2213v1 [math.CO] 10 Jan 2014

Planar digraphs of digirth five are 2-colorable

Ararat Harutyunyan*
Laboratoire de Recherche en Informatique
Université Paris-Sud
91405 Orsay, France
email: ararat@lri.fr

Bojan Mohar†‡
Department of Mathematics
Simon Fraser University
Burnaby, B.C. V5A 1S6
email: mohar@sfu.ca

January 13, 2014

Abstract

Neumann-Lara (1985) and Škrekovski conjectured that every planar digraph with digirth at least three is 2-colorable. We prove a relaxed version of this conjecture: every planar digraph of digirth at least five is 2-colorable. The result also holds in the setting of list colorings.

Keywords: Planar digraph, digraph chromatic number, dichromatic number, discharging.

1 Introduction

Let D be a digraph without cycles of length ≤ 2, and let G be the underlying undirected graph of D. A function $f\colon V(D) \to \{1, \ldots, k\}$ is a *k-coloring* of the digraph D if $V_i = f^{-1}(i)$ is acyclic in D for every $i = 1, \ldots, k$. Here we treat the vertex set V_i *acyclic* if the induced subdigraph $D[V_i]$ contains no directed cycles (but $G[V_i]$ may contain cycles). We say that D

*Research supported by a Digiteo postdoctoral scholarship.

†Supported in part by an NSERC Discovery Grant (Canada), by the Canada Research Chair program, and by the Research Grant P1–0297 of ARRS (Slovenia).

‡On leave from: IMFM & FMF, Department of Mathematics, University of Ljubljana, Ljubljana, Slovenia.

is *k-colorable* if it admits a k-coloring. The minimum k for which D is k-colorable is called the *chromatic number* of D, and is denoted by $\chi(D)$ (see Neumann-Lara [4]).

The following conjecture was proposed independently by Neumann-Lara [5] and Škrekovski (see [1]).

Conjecture 1.1. *Every planar digraph D with no directed cycles of length at most 2 is 2-colorable.*

The *digirth* of a digraph is the length of its shortest directed cycle (∞ if D is acyclic). It is an easy consequence of 5-degeneracy of planar graphs that every planar digraph D with digirth at least 3 has chromatic number at most 3.

There seem to be lack of methods to attack Conjecture 1.1, and no nontrivial partial results are known. The main result of this paper is the following theorem whose proof is based on elaborate use of (nowadays standard) discharging technique.

Theorem 1.2. *Every planar digraph that has digirth at least five is 2-colorable.*

The proof of Theorem 1.2 is deferred until Section 4. Actually, we shall prove an extended version in the setting of list-colorings which we define next.

Let $\mathcal{C}$ be a finite set of colors. Given a digraph D, let $L : v \mapsto L(v) \subseteq \mathcal{C}$ be a *list-assignment* for D, which assigns to each vertex $v \in V(D)$ a set of colors. The set $L(v)$ is called the *list* (or the set of *admissible colors*) for v. We say D is *L-colorable* if there is an *L-coloring* of D, i.e., each vertex v is assigned a color from $L(v)$ such that every color class induces an acyclic set in D. A *k-list-assignment* for D is a list-assignment L such that $|L(v)| = k$ for every $v \in V(D)$. We say that D is *k-choosable* if it is L-colorable for every k-list-assignment L.

Theorem 1.3. *Every planar digraph of digirth at least five is 2-choosable.*

The rest of the paper is devoted to the proof of Theorem 1.3.

2 Unavoidable configurations

In this section we provide a list of unavoidable configurations used in the proof of Theorem 1.3. Orientations of edges are not important at this point, so we shall consider only undirected graphs throughout the whole section.

We define a *configuration* as a plane graph C together with a function $\delta : U \to \mathbb{N}$, where $U \subseteq V(C)$, such that $\delta(v) \geq deg_C(v)$ for every $v \in V(C)$. A plane graph G *contains* the configuration (C, U, δ) if there is a mapping $h : V(C) \to V(G)$ with the following properties:

(i) For every edge $ab \in E(C)$, $h(a)h(b)$ is an edge of G.

(ii) For every facial walk $a_1 \dots a_k$ in C, except for the unbounded face, the image $h(a_1) \dots h(a_k)$ is a facial walk in G.



Figure 1: Configurations Q_1 to Q_5



Figure 2: Configurations Q_6 to Q_9

(iii) For every $a \in U$, the degree of $h(a)$ in G is equal to $\delta(a)$.

(iv) h is *locally one-to-one*, i.e., it is one-to-one on the neighbors of each vertex of $V(C)$.

Configurations used in the paper are shown in Figures 1–4. The vertices shown as squares, pentagons, or hexagons represent the vertices in U and their values $\delta(u)$ are 4, 5, and 6, respectively. The vertices in $V(C) \setminus U$ are shown as smaller full circles. The configurations shown in these figures may contains additional notation that will be used in the proofs later in the paper.

The goal of this section is to prove the following theorem.

Theorem 2.1. *Every plane graph of minimum degree at least four contains one of the configurations $Q_1, \ldots, Q_{25}$ depicted in Figures 1–4.*

In the proof, we will use the following terminology. If v is a vertex of degree k in G, then we call it a *k-vertex*, and a vertex of degree at least k (at most k) will also be referred to as a *k^+-vertex* (*k^--vertex*). A neighbor of v whose degree is k is a *k-neighbor* (similarly *k^+-* and *k^--neighbor*). A face f that has size at least five is called a *major face*; if f has size at most 4 it is called a *minor face*. A *k-face* is a face of size k. By a *triangle* we refer to a face of size 3. An *r-s-t triangle* is a triangle whose vertices have degree r, s and t, respectively. An *r^+-s^+-t^+ triangle* is defined similarly. A triangle is said to be *bad* if it is a 5-4-4 triangle that is adjacent to at most two major faces.

Proof of Theorem 2.1. The proof uses the discharging method. Assume, for a contradiction, that there is a plane graph G that contains none of the configurations shown in Figures



Figure 3: Configurations Q_{10} to Q_{20}

1–4. We shall refer to these configurations as $Q_1, \ldots, Q_{25}$. Let G be a counterexample of minimum order. To each vertex or face x of G, we assign the *charge* of $c(x) = \deg(x) - 4$. A well-known consequence of Euler's formula is that the total charge is always negative, $\sum_{x \in V(G) \cup F(G)} c(x) = -8$. We are going to apply the following *discharging rules*:

R1: A k-face ($k \geq 5$) adjacent to r triangles sends charge of $(k-4)/r$ to each adjacent triangle.

R2: A 5-vertex v incident to exactly one triangle sends charge 1 to that triangle. A 5-vertex incident to exactly three triangles, sends charge 1/3 to each triangle. A 5-vertex incident to exactly two triangles sends charge 1/2 to each triangle unless (i) at least one of the triangles is a bad triangle in which case v sends charge of 3/5 to each bad triangle and charge of 2/5 to each non-bad triangle, or (ii) none of the triangles is bad, one of them is incident to a 4-vertex and the other is not, in which case v sends charge 2/3 to the triangle with the 4-vertex and 1/3 to the other triangle.

R3: A 6-vertex v adjacent to a 6-4-4 triangle T sends charge (i) 4/5 to T if T is incident to exactly one major face, (ii) 3/5 to T if T is incident to exactly two major faces, and (iii) 2/5 to T if T is incident to three major faces.



Figure 4: Configurations Q_{21} to Q_{25}

R4: A 6^+-vertex v adjacent to a 6^+-5^+-5^+ triangle T sends charge $1/3$ to T unless T is a 6^+-5-5 triangle with a 6^+-5 edge incident to a 4-face and the 5-5 edge incident to a triangle, in which case v sends charge $7/15$ to T.

R5: A 6-vertex v incident to a 6-5-4 triangle $T = uvw$. Then v sends charge $1 - x - y$, where x is the total charge sent to T by the rule R1 and y is the charge sent to T by the rule R2.

R6: A 6-vertex v incident to a 6-4-7^+ triangle T sends charge $1/3$ to T.

R7: A 6-vertex v incident to a 6-6-4 triangle T sends charge (i) $1/2$ to T if T is incident to no major faces, (ii) $2/5$ to T if T is incident to exactly one major face, (iii) $3/10$ if T is incident to exactly two major faces, (iv) $1/5$ if T is incident to three major faces.

R8: A 7^+-vertex v incident to a 7^+-4-4 triangle T sends charge $4/5$ to T.

R9: A 7^+-vertex v incident to a 7^+-5^+-4 triangle T sends charge $2/3$ to T.

R*: After rules R1–R9 have been applied, each triangle T with positive current charge equally redistributes its excess charge among those incident 5-5-4 triangles that have negative charge.

First, let us state two simple observations that will be used repeatedly.

Claim 1. *A 5-vertex sends charge of at least $1/3$ to every incident triangle.*

Claim 2. *A major face sends charge of at least $1/5$ to every adjacent triangle.*

For $x \in V(G) \cup F(G)$, let $c^*(x)$ be the *final charge* obtained after applying rules R1–R9 and R* to G. We will show that every vertex and face has non-negative final charge. This will yield a contradiction since the initial total charge of -8 must be preserved.

4^+-faces: Since the charge of a 4^+-face only changes by rule R1, it is clear that every such face has a nonnegative final charge.

3-faces: Let $T = uvw$ be a triangle. Then $c(T) = -1$. We will show that $c^*(T) \geq 0$. We consider a few cases.

Case 1: T is a 4-4-4 triangle. This case is not possible since Q_3 is excluded.

Case 2: T is a 5-4-4 triangle. Let $deg(u) = 5$ and $deg(v) = deg(w) = 4$. We may assume that u is incident to at least two triangles, for otherwise $c^*(T) \geq 0$. Since Q_1 and Q_5 are excluded, u is incident to precisely one other triangle T'. If T is not a bad triangle, then all of its incident faces are major and by R1 and R2, $c^*(T) \geq -1+1/5+1/5+1/5+2/5 \geq 0$. Now, suppose that T is a bad triangle. If T is incident to two major faces, then by R1 and R2, $c^*(T) \geq -1+1/5+1/5+3/5 \geq 0$. Now, assume that T is incident to at most one major face. Since Q_1 and Q_2 are excluded, the face incident to the edge vw is the major face, and the faces incident to uv and uw are both 4-faces. But now, the exclusion of Q_9 implies that u cannot be incident to any other triangle except T, a contradiction.

Case 3: T is a 6^+-4-4 triangle. Let $deg(u) \geq 6$ and $deg(v) = deg(w) = 4$. Since Q_1 and Q_2 are excluded, T is adjacent to at least one major face. Since a major face always sends charge at least $1/5$ to an adjacent triangle, it follows by the rule R3 (if $deg(u) = 6$) or R8 (if $deg(u) \geq 7$) that $c^*(T) \geq 0$.

Case 4: T is a 5-5-4 triangle. Let $deg(v) = 4$ and $deg(u) = deg(w) = 5$. We consider several subcases.

Subcase (a): T is incident to at least two major faces. In this case, by rules R1 and R2, T receives total charge of at least $1/3 + 1/3 + 1/5 + 1/5 > 1$, which implies that $c^*(T) \geq 0$.

Subcase (b): T is incident to no major faces. First, suppose that all faces adjacent to T are 4-faces. Since Q_7 is excluded, each of u and w is incident to at most one other triangle besides T. If u (or w) is incident to no other triangle, then T receives a charge of 1 from u (or w) and $c^*(T) \geq 0$. Therefore, we may assume that each of u and w is incident to exactly two triangles. But now, the exclusion of Q_9 implies that none of u and w are incident to a (bad) 5-4-4 triangle. Therefore, each of u and w send charge of $1/2$ to T by the rule R2. Hence, $c^*(T) \geq 0$.

The remaining possibility (by exclusion of Q_1) is that the face incident to uw is a triangle and the faces incident to uv and vw are 4-faces. However, this gives the configuration Q_6.

Subcase (c): T is incident to exactly one major face. We consider several subcases. First, assume that the face incident to the edge uw is a triangle T'. Since Q_1 is excluded, we may assume by symmetry that the face incident to uv is a 4-face S and the face incident to vw is a major face R. If any of u or w is incident to no other triangles except T and T', then T receives a total charge of at least $1/2+1/3+1/5 > 1$ by rules R1 and R2, yielding $c^*(T) \geq 0$. Therefore, we may assume that each of u and w is incident to exactly three triangles. Since Q_{21} and Q_{15} are excluded, we may assume that G contains the configuration P_1 shown in

Figure 5. Clearly, $deg(u_3) \geq 5$ since Q_1 is excluded. Suppose first that $deg(u_3) = 5$. Note that the face $F \neq T'$ incident to the edge u_3w cannot be a triangle since Q_4 is excluded. Now, the exclusion of Q_{14} implies that the face F is a major face. Therefore, T' receives a total charge of at least $1/3 + 1/3 + 1/3 + 1/5 = 6/5$ after the rules R1–R9 have been applied. Note that by the exclusion of Q_{13}, T is the only 5-5-4 triangle that is adjacent to T'. Hence, T' sends charge of at least $6/5 - 1 = 1/5$ to T by the rule R*. Therefore, the total charge sent to T is at least $1/3 + 1/3 + 1/5 + 1/5 > 1$, resulting in $c^*(T) > 0$. Next, suppose that $deg(u_3) \geq 6$. If F is a major face, then T' receives a total charge of at least $1/3+1/3+1/3+1/5 = 6/5$ after the rules R1–R9 have been applied. Since u_3 is a 6^+-vertex, T is the only 5-5-4 triangle incident to T' and therefore by rule R* it receives charge of $1/5$ from T'. As before, $c^*(T) \geq 0$. Now, suppose that F is a 4-face. By the rule R4, u sends charge $7/15$ to T'. Hence the total charge received by T' is $1/3 + 1/3 + 7/15 = 17/15$. This implies that T' sends charge of $17/15 - 1 = 2/15$ to T by the rule R*. It follows that T receives total charge of at least $1/3 + 1/3 + 1/5 + 2/15 = 1$. Hence, $c^*(T) \geq 0$.

Next, assume that the face incident to the edge uw is a 4-face. Since Q_1 is excluded, it follows that T is not adjacent to any triangles. Therefore, we may assume without loss of generality that the face incident to uv is a 4-face and the face adjacent to the edge vw is a major face. If none of u and w are incident to three triangles, then by the rules R1 and R2, T receives a charge of at least $2/5 + 2/5 + 1/5 = 1$, and we are done. Therefore, we may suppose that either u or w is incident to three triangles. First, suppose that u is incident to three triangles. By the exclusion of Q_{16} and Q_{17}, w is incident to at most two triangles and no triangle incident to w is a 5-4-4 triangle. By the rule R2, w sends charge of at least $1/2$ to T. Hence, T receives total charge of at least $1/2 + 1/3 + 1/5 > 1$, which implies that $c^*(T) \geq 0$. Now, suppose that w is incident to three triangles. By the exclusions of Q_{16} and Q_{18}, u is incident to at most two triangles none of which is a 5-4-4 triangle. Therefore, u sends charge of at least $1/2$ to T, and as before we obtain that $c^*(T) \geq 0$.

Finally, assume that the face incident to the edge uw is a major face. Since Q_1 is excluded it follows that the faces incident to the edges uv and vw are both 4-faces. If none of u and w are incident to three triangles, then by the rules R1 and R2, T receives a charge of at least $2/5 + 2/5 + 1/5 = 1$, and we are done. Therefore, we may assume by symmetry that u is incident to three triangles. By the exclusion of Q_{19} and Q_{20}, w is incident to at most two triangles, none of which is a 5-4-4 triangle. By R2, w sends charge of at least $1/2$ to T. Hence, T receives total charge of at least $1/2 + 1/3 + 1/5 > 1$, which implies that $c^*(T) \geq 0$.

Case 5: T is a 6-5-4 triangle. By the rules R1, R2 and R5, T receives a total charge of 1 after the discharging rules have been applied. Hence, $c^*(T) \geq 0$.

Case 6: T is a 6-6-4 triangle. Clearly, only rules R1 and R7 apply to T. If T is adjacent to no major faces, each 6-vertex contained in T sends charge of $1/2$ to T, which yields $c^*(T) \geq 0$. If T is adjacent to one major face, each 6-vertex contained in T sends charge of $2/5$ to T, and T receives a charge of at least $2/5 + 2/5 + 1/5 = 1$. If T is adjacent to two major faces, each 6-vertex contained in T sends charge of $3/10$ to T, and T receives charge of at least $3/10 + 3/10 + 1/5 + 1/5 = 1$, and we are done. If T is adjacent to three major faces, each 6-vertex contained in T sends charge of $1/5$ to T, and T receives charge


u_1 u_2 u_3 u v_1 T' T F v w w_1 M v_2 w_2 P_1
u_2 u_3 u_1 u_4 v_1 S_1 u S_2 w_1 T v w M v_2 w_2 T_1
u_2 u_3 u_1 u_4 F u M w_1 v_1 T v w M v_2 w_2 T_2
u_2 u_3 u_1 u_4 v_1 M u M T w_1 v w M v_2 w_2 T_3
u_2 u_1 u_3 F_2 v_1 u u_4 T F_1 v w w_1 v_2 w_2 T_4
u_2 u_1 u_3 u u_4 v_1 T B v w w_1 v_2 w_2 T_5
u_2 u_3 u_1 u_4 v_1 u w_1 T v w w_2 v_2 w_3 T_6
u_2 u_1 u_3 v_1 F_1 u u_4 T v w w_1 F_2 v_2 w_2 T_7
u_2 u_1 u_3 v_1 F_1 u u_4 T v w 6^+ v_2 T_8

Figure 5: Discharging analysis

of at least $1/5 + 1/5 + 1/5 + 1/5 + 1/5 = 1$. Thus, in all cases $c^*(T) \geq 0$.

Case 7: T is a 7^+-5^+-4 triangle. By rule R9, the 7^+-vertex incident to T sends charge of $2/3$ to T. By rules R2, R6 and R9, the 5^+-vertex sends charge of at least $1/3$ to T. Thus, T receives a total charge of at least 1, and $c^*(T) \geq 0$.

Case 8: T is a 5^+-5^+-5^+ triangle. Since the rule R7 is clearly not applied to T, each 5^+-vertex incident to T sends charge of at least $1/3$ to T. Hence, $c^*(T) \geq 0$.

4-vertices: If v is a 4-vertex, then $c(v) = 0$. Since v neither receives nor gives any charge, we have $c^*(v) = 0$.

5-vertices: Let v be a 5-vertex. If v is incident to exactly one triangle, then clearly by rule R2, $c^*(v) = 0$. If v is incident to exactly three triangles, again by rule R2, $c^*(v) = 0$. Note that v is incident to at most three triangles since Q_4 is excluded. Hence, it remains to consider the case that v is incident to exactly two triangles T_1 and T_2. To show that $c^*(v) \geq 0$, by R2 it is sufficient to show that not both of T_1 and T_2 are bad. This follows from the exclusion of Q_1, Q_2, Q_8 and Q_9.

6-vertices: A 6-vertex u has initial charge of 2. We break the analysis into several cases,

depending on what type of triangles u is incident to. Often we will reduce the analysis to previously considered cases.

Case 1: u is incident to a 6-4-4 triangle. Suppose $T = uvw$ is a 6-4-4 triangle, with $deg(v) = deg(w) = 4$. Since Q_1 and Q_2 are excluded, none of adjacent faces to T are triangles, and the face incident to vw is a major face. The possible cases are outlined in Figure 5 as configurations T_1–T_3. When such a configuration T_i occurs at u, we say that u is a *type T_i vertex*. Note that in the figure, a face marked by M stands for a major face.

Subcase (a): u is a type T_1 vertex. Note that u sends charge of $4/5$ to T by rule R3. We consider a few cases depending on the number of triangles incident to u. Since Q_{11} is excluded, u cannot be incident to four triangles. Since a 6-vertex never sends charge more than $4/5$ to a triangle, u sends total charge of at most $8/5 < 2$, yielding a positive final charge for u when u is incident to at most two triangles. Therefore, we may assume that u is incident to exactly three triangles. Since Q_{11} is excluded, we may assume without loss of generality that u_2u_3, u_3u_4 are edges, but u_1u_2 is not. Clearly, by exclusion of Q_1, u_3 is a 5^+-vertex. Therefore, u sends charge to the triangles uu_2u_3 and uu_3u_4 by rules R4–R7. The most charge sent out by rule R5 is $2/3$ and most sent out by other rules is $1/2$. Since $4/5 + 2/3 + 1/2 < 2$ and $c(u) = 2$, it suffices to check what happens if rule R5 is applied twice. In such a case we have $deg(u_2) = deg(u_4) = 4$ and $deg(u_3) = 5$. Since Q_{10} is excluded, the face F bounded by u_1u and uu_2 is a major face. But in this case, by rule R5, u sends charge of at most $1 - 1/3 - 1/5 = 7/15$ to the triangle uu_2u_3. Thus, the final charge sent by u is again at most $7/15 + 2/3 + 4/5 < 2$.

Subcase (b): u is a type T_2 vertex. First, assume that u is incident to four triangles. This implies that u_1u_2, u_2u_3 and u_3u_4 are all edges. Suppose that u_1 is a 5^+-vertex. By exclusion of Q_1, u_2 and u_3 are 5^+-vertices. By rule R4, u sends charge at most $7/15$ to the triangle uu_1u_2, and $1/3$ to the triangle u_2uu_3. Since the triangle uu_3u_4 is incident to at least one major face, by rules R4-R7, u sends charge of at most $7/15$ to the triangle uu_3u_4. By rule R3, u sends charge $3/5$ to T. Therefore, the total charge sent by u is at most $7/15 + 1/3 + 7/15 + 3/5 = 28/15 < 2$, yielding $c^*(u) > 0$. On the other hand, if u_1 is a 4-vertex, exclusion of Q_{12} implies that $deg(u_2) \geq 6$. Again, we see that u sends charge of at most $1/2 + 1/3 + 7/15 + 3/5 < 2$.

Now, assume that u is incident to at most three triangles. By subcase (a), we may assume that u is not a type T_1 vertex (for another triangle incident with u). Hence, we may assume u never sends charge $4/5$ to a triangle. By rules R3–R7, it is clear to see that u sends charge at most $2/3$ to each triangle. Since there are at most three triangles, u sends total charge of at most 2, resulting in $c^*(u) \geq 0$.

Subcase (c): u is a type T_3 vertex. Again, u is incident to at most four triangles. First, assume that u is incident to exactly four. This implies that u_1u_2, u_2u_3 and u_3u_4 are all edges. By the exclusion of Q_1, u_2 and u_3 are both 5^+-vertices. This implies that u sends charge $1/3$ to the triangle uu_2u_3.

Since the triangle uu_1u_2 is incident to at least one major face, by rules R4-R7, u sends charge of at most $7/15$ to the triangle uu_1u_2. Similarly, u sends at most $7/15$ to the triangle uu_3u_4. By rule R3, u sends charge at most $2/5$ to the triangle T. Therefore, u sends total

charge of at most $1/3 + 7/15 + 7/15 + 2/5 < 2$, yielding $c^*(u) \geq 0$.

The case that u is incident to at most three triangles is handled by an identical argument as in the previous subcase.

Case 2: u is incident to a 6-5-4 triangle. Suppose $T = uvw$ is a 6-5-4 triangle, with $deg(v) = 4$ and $deg(w) = 5$. Since Q_1 is excluded, the faces different from T that are incident to the edges uv and vw are not triangles. We consider the subcases shown in Figure 5 as T_4–T_7; in T_7, at least one of F_1, F_2 is a major face, and it will be argued later why we may assume that u is incident with 5 triangles. We may assume that u is not incident to any 6-4-4 triangle, and consequently, never sends more than $2/3$ charge to any triangle. In particular, we may assume that u is incident with four or five triangles.

Subcase (a): u is a type T_4 vertex. In this case, u is incident to precisely four triangles since the configuration Q_{22} is excluded. Additionally, uu_2u_3 is a triangle. First, assume that u_3u_4 is an edge (and consequently, u_1u_2 is not an edge). Since Q_1 is excluded, we have that both u_3 and u_4 are 5^+-vertices. Therefore, by rule R4, u sends charge $1/3$ to each of the triangles uwu_4 and uu_3u_4. Since u sends charge of at most $2/3$ to each of the other two incident triangles, we have $c^*(u) \geq 0$.

Second, assume that u_1u_2 is an edge (consequently, u_3u_4 is not an edge). We divide the analysis into two cases, depending on whether the face F_2 bounded by the edges uu_3 and uu_4 is a 4-face or a major face. If F_2 is a 4-face, then the exclusion of Q_{23} implies that u_4 is a 6^+-vertex, and the exclusion of Q_{24} implies that u_3 is a 5^+-vertex. Therefore, u sends charge of $1/3$ to the triangle F_1 by rule R4. If u sends charge of at most $1/3$ to another incident triangle, then $c^*(u) \geq 0$. Thus, we may assume that u sends charge $7/15$ to the triangle uu_2u_3 by the last subcase in rule R4. Therefore, $\deg(u_2) = \deg(u_3) = 5$. By excluding Q_{25}, we see that u_1 is a 5^+-vertex. By rule R4, u sends total charge of at most $14/15 < 1$ to the triangles uu_1u_2 and uu_2u_3, and we are done.

Now, suppose that F_2 is a major face. Then u sends charge $1/3$ to the triangle uu_4w by rule R4. Since u sends charge of $2/3$ to T, it suffices to show that u sends total charge of at most 1 to the triangles uu_1u_2 and uu_2u_3. If u_2 is a 6^+-vertex, then u sends charge of at most $2/5$ to the triangle uu_2u_3 and charge of at most $1/2$ to the triangle uu_1u_2 by one of the rules R4, R6 or R7. Otherwise, u_2 is a 5-vertex. Then u sends at most $7/15$ to the triangle uu_2u_3. If u_1 is a 5^+-vertex, u sends charge at most $7/15$ to the triangle uu_1u_2 by the rule R4, and we are done. Therefore, we may assume that u_1 is a 4-vertex. We may assume that the second face incident to the edge u_1u_2 is a 4-face, for otherwise u sends charge at most $7/15$ to the triangle uu_1u_2 by rule R5, and we are done. Furthermore, if u_2 is not incident to any other triangles except uu_1u_2 and uu_2u_3, then by rule R5, u sends charge of at most $1/2$ to the triangle uu_1u_2 and again, we are done. Therefore, we may assume that u_2 is incident to a third triangle T'. Since the configuration Q_{21} is forbidden, T' contains the edge u_2u_3. But now, the exclusion of Q_1 implies that u_3 is a 5^+-vertex, and in fact, u sends charge of $1/3$ to the triangle uu_2u_3. Since u sends charge of at most $2/3$ to the triangle uu_1u_2, we are done.

Subcase (b): u is a type T_5 vertex. Note that B in the figure denotes a "big" face – a face of size at least 4. Also, note that the face determined by the edges ww_1 and ww_2 cannot

be a triangle since Q_{21} is excluded. Therefore, in this subcase w is incident to two triangles. Therefore, w sends charge 2/3 to T (by rule R2(ii)) if $deg(u_4) \neq 4$. Thus, if $deg(u_4) \neq 4$, u sends 1/3 to T.

First, assume that u is incident to five triangles, i.e., the edges u_1u_2, u_2u_3, u_3u_4 are all present. The exclusion of Q_1 implies that u_2, u_3, u_4 are all 5^+-vertices. Now, by rule R5, u sends charge of 1/3 to T. By rule R4, u sends charge of 1/3 to each of the triangles uu_4w, uu_3u_4 and uu_2u_3. By rules R4–R7, u sends charge of at most 2/3 to the triangle uu_1u_2. Therefore, the total charge sent by u is at most $1/3 + 1/3 + 1/3 + 1/3 + 2/3 = 2$, which implies that $c^*(u) \geq 0$.

Next, assume that u is incident to exactly four triangles. There are three possibilities.

First, assume that u_2u_3 and u_3u_4 are edges (and u_1u_2 is not). Then the exclusion of Q_1 implies that u_3 and u_4 are both 5^+-vertices. As before, u sends charge of 1/3 to T, charge of 1/3 to uu_4w and 1/3 to uu_3u_4. Since u sends charge of at most 2/3 to the triangle uu_2u_3, we have $c^*(u) \geq 0$.

Second, assume that u_1u_2 and u_3u_4 are edges (and u_2u_3 is not). As before, u_4 is a 5^+-vertex. Then u sends charge 1/3 to each of the triangles T and uwu_4, and charge of at most 2/3 to each of the triangles uu_1u_2 and uu_3u_4. Thus, u sends total charge of at most $1/3 + 1/3 + 2/3 + 2/3 = 2$.

Finally, assume that u_1u_2 and u_2u_3 are edges, and u_3u_4 is a non-edge. If u_4 is a 4-vertex, then u sends charge of 1/2 to T and charge of at most 1/2 to the triangle uu_4w. If u_4 is a 5^+-vertex, then u sends charge of 1/3 to T and charge of at most 7/15 to uu_4w. Thus, u sends charge of at most 1 to the triangles T and uu_4w. Therefore, it is sufficient to show that u sends a total charge of at most 1 to the triangles uu_1u_2 and uu_2u_3.

Clearly, u_2 is a 5^+-vertex since Q_1 is excluded. If u_2 is a 6^+-vertex, then u sends charge at most 1/2 to each of the triangles uu_1u_2 and uu_2u_3 by the rules R4, R6 and R7. Therefore, we may assume that u_2 is a 5-vertex. It is sufficient to show that u sends charge of at most 1/2 to each of the triangles uu_1u_2 and uu_2u_3. If u_1 is a 5^+-vertex then by rule R4, u sends charge of at most 7/15 to uu_1u_2. If u_1 is a 4-vertex, then by the exclusion of Q_{21} (and Q_1), the triangle uu_1u_2 is either incident to a major face, or u_2 is incident to only two triangles or u is a type T_4 vertex (for the triangle uu_1u_2). Since we may assume that u is not a type T_4 vertex, it follows that u sends charge of at most 1/2 to the triangle uu_1u_2. A similar argument applied to u_3 shows that u sends charge of at most 1/2 to the triangle uu_2u_3.

Subcase (c): u is a type T_6 vertex. Since we may assume that u is not a type T_1 vertex, by rules R3–R7, u never sends charge of more than 2/3 to an incident triangle. Therefore, if u is incident to at most three triangles, we have that $c^*(u) \geq 0$. Since u is a type T_6 vertex, it is incident to four triangles. Therefore, the only possibility we have is when u_1u_2, u_2u_3, u_3u_4 are all edges. By exclusion of Q_1, we have that u_2 and u_3 are both 5^+-vertices. It follows that u sends charge of 1/3 to the triangle uu_2u_3 by rule R4. Since u sends charge of at most 2/3 to the triangle T, it is sufficient to show that u sends charge of at most 1/2 to each of the triangles uu_1u_2 and uu_3u_4. Consider the triangle uu_1u_2. If u_2 is a 6^+-vertex, then by rules R4, R6 and R7, u sends charge of at most 1/2 to the triangle uu_1u_2. Therefore, we may assume that u_2 is a 5-vertex. We may assume that u_1 is a 4-vertex, for

otherwise by rule R4, u sends charge of at most $7/15$ to uu_1u_2, and we are done. This implies (by the exclusion of Q_1) that the second face incident to the edge u_1u_2 is a 4^+-face. If it is a 4-face, then u is actually a type T_4 or T_5 vertex, and we are done by the previous analysis. Therefore, we may assume that the edge u_1u_2 is incident to a major face. But then, by the rule R5, u sends charge of at most $7/15$ to the triangle uu_1u_2. An identical argument shows that u sends charge of at most $1/2$ to the triangle uu_3u_4. Thus, in all cases $c^*(u) \geq 0$.

Subcase (d): T is incident to at least one major face. Since we may assume that u is not a type T_i vertex, for any $1 \leq i \leq 6$, it follows that u is not incident to a 6-4-4 triangle, and sends a charge of at most $7/15$ to any incident 6-5-4 triangle. Therefore, by rules R4–R7, u sends a charge of at most $1/2$ to any incident triangle. It follows that if u is incident to at most four triangles, then $c^*(u) \geq 0$. Since the edge uv is incident to a 4^+-face by the exclusion of Q_1, we may assume that we have the configuration T_7 of Figure 5, where at least one of the faces F_1 and F_2 is a major face. It follows that the vertices u_2, u_3, u_4 are all 5^+ vertices, and by rule R4, u sends charge of $1/3$ to each of the triangles uu_2u_3, uu_3u_4 and uu_4w. Since either F_1 or F_2 is a major face, it follows that u sends charge of at most $7/15$ to T by the rule R5. Since u sends charge of at most $1/2$ to any triangle, we have that the total charge sent by u is at most $1/3 + 1/3 + 1/3 + 7/15 + 1/2 < 2$, yielding $c^*(u) > 0$.

Case 3: u is incident to a 6-6^+-4 triangle. Suppose $T = uvw$ is a 6-6^+-4 triangle, with $deg(v) = 4$. By cases 1 and 2, we may assume that u is neither incident to a 6-4-4 triangle nor to a 6-5-4 triangle. Therefore, rules R3 and R5 never apply to u, and by rules R4, R6 and R7, u sends charge of at most $1/2$ to each incident triangle. Thus, if u is incident to at most four triangles, $c^*(u) \geq 0$. Therefore, we may assume that u is incident to at least five triangles. Since the face F_1 incident to the edge uv cannot be a triangle (by the exclusion of Q_1), it follows that the only possibility left to consider is the configuration T_8 in Figure 5. Now, by exclusion of Q_1, u_2, u_3, u_4 are all 5^+ vertices, and hence, by rule R4, u sends charge of $1/3$ to each of the triangles uu_2u_3, uu_3u_4 and uu_4w. Since u never sends charge of more than $1/2$ to an incident triangle, we get that u sends a total charge of at most $1/3 + 1/3 + 1/3 + 1/2 + 1/2 = 2$, as required.

Case 4: u is incident to a 6-5^+-5^+ triangle. Suppose $T = uvw$ is a 6-5^+-5^+ triangle. By cases 1–3, we may assume that u is not incident to any triangle that contains a 4-vertex. Therefore, only rule R4 applies to u, and consequently u sends charge of either $1/3$ or $7/15$ to any incident triangle. Therefore, if u is incident to at most four triangles, $c^*(u) \geq 0$. If u is incident to six triangles, then rule R4 implies that u sends charge $1/3$ to each triangle, yielding $c^*(u) = 0$. Therefore, we may assume that u is incident to exactly five triangles. But then it is clear that there are at most two triangles incident to u to which it sends charge of $7/15$. Thus, in this case as well, u sends charge of at most $7/15 + 7/15 + 1/3 + 1/3 + 1/3 < 2$, as required.

7^+-vertices: Let u be a 7^+-vertex. First, assume that $deg(u) = d \geq 8$. Note that by rules R4, and R8–R9, u sends charge of at most $4/5$ to any incident triangle, and charge of $2/3$ if it is not incident to an 8^+-4-4 triangle. Therefore, if u is incident to at most $d - 3$ triangles, then it sends total charge of at most $\frac{4}{5}(d-3) \leq d - 4$, since $d \geq 8$. Therefore, in this case $c^*(u) \geq 0$. Hence, we may assume that u is incident to at least $d - 2$ triangles. If

u is incident to at least $d-1$ triangles, then the exclusion of Q_1 implies that at least $d-3$ of these triangles are 8^+-5^+-5^+ triangles and that none of the triangles is an 8^+-4-4 triangle. Note that none of the $d-3$ mentioned 8^+-5^+-5^+ triangles have a 4-face incident to an 8^+-5^+ edge. Hence, u sends charge of at most $\frac{1}{3}(d-3)+3\left(\frac{2}{3}\right) \leq d-4$ for $d \geq 8$. Hence, in this case as well $c^*(u) \geq 0$. Thus, we may assume that u is incident to exactly $d-2$ triangles. Now, the exclusion of Q_1 implies that u is incident to at most one 8^+-4-4 triangle and at least one 8^+-5^+-5^+ triangle. Therefore, u sends charge of at most $4/5+7/15+\frac{2}{3}(d-4) \leq d-4$, and $c^*(u) \geq 0$.

Now, suppose that $d=7$. Then u has charge $+3$. Since u sends charge of at most $4/5$ to any incident triangle, we may assume that u is incident to at least four triangles. If u is incident to seven triangles, then by exclusion of Q_1 they are all 7-5^+-5^+ triangles, and hence u sends total charge of $7/3 < 3$. If u is incident to six triangles, then the exclusion of Q_1 implies that u is incident to at least four 7-5^+-5^+ triangles and to no 7-4-4 triangle. Clearly, u sends charge of at most $1/3$ to each 7-5^+-5^+ triangle. Therefore, in this case u sends total charge of at most $4\left(\frac{1}{3}\right)+2\left(\frac{2}{3}\right) < 3$. Now, suppose that u is incident to five triangles. We consider two cases. First, suppose that u is incident to a 7-4-4 triangle. Note that by exclusion of Q_1, u is incident to at most one such triangle. Also, by exclusion of Q_1, we have that u is incident to at least two 7-5^+-5^+ triangles. Clearly, u sends charge of $1/3$ to each of these 7-5^+-5^+ triangles. Therefore, u sends total charge of at most $4/5+1/3+1/3+2/3+2/3 < 3$. Secondly, suppose that u is incident to no 7-4-4 triangle. Then u sends charge of at most $2/3$ to any incident triangle. Since u is incident to five triangles, the exclusion of Q_1 implies that u is incident to at least one 7-5^+-5^+ triangle to which it only sends charge of $1/3$. Therefore, u sends total charge of at most $\frac{1}{3}+4\left(\frac{2}{3}\right) = 3$, which implies that $c^*(u) \geq 0$. Lastly, suppose that u is incident to four triangles. This implies by the exclusion of Q_1 that u is incident to at most two 7-4-4 triangles. Hence, u sends total charge of at most $4/5+4/5+2/3+2/3 = 44/15 < 3$. Thus, in all cases, $c^*(u) \geq 0$. □

3 Reducibility

Let us first introduce some notation that will be used in the rest of the paper. If either uv or vu is an arc in a digraph D, we say that uv is an *edge* of D. We will consider a planar digraph D, its underlying graph G, and a 2-list-assignment L, where $L(v) \subseteq \mathcal{C}$ and $|L(v)| = 2$ for every $v \in V(D)$. Given a non-proper L-coloring ϕ of D, a *color-i cycle* is a directed cycle in D whose every vertex is colored with color i, for $i \in \mathcal{C}$. When we speak of vertex *degrees*, we always mean degrees in G. For the digraph D, the *out-degree* and the *in-degree* of a vertex v are denoted by $d^+(v)$ and $d^-(v)$, respectively.

If D is a digraph drawn in the plane and C is a configuration (which is an undirected graph), we say that D *contains* the configuration C if the underlying undirected graph G of D contains C. A configuration C is called *reducible* if it cannot occur in a minimum counterexample to Theorem 1.3. Showing that every planar digraph D of minimum degree at least 4 and with digirth at least five contains a reducible configuration will imply that every such digraph is 2-choosable.

Throughout this section, we assume that D is a planar digraph with digirth at least five that is a counterexample to the theorem with a 2-list-assignment L such that every proper subdigraph of D is L-colorable. In most statements, we will consider a special vertex $v \in V(D)$, and we shall assume that $L(v) = \{1, 2\}$. The following lemma shows that the minimum degree of D is at least four and that each vertex has in-degree and out-degree at least two.

Lemma 3.1. *Let $v \in V(D)$. Then in every L-coloring of $D - v$, each color in $L(v)$ appears at least once among the out-neighbors and at least once among the in-neighbors of v. Consequently, every $v \in V(D)$ has $d^+(v) \geq 2$ and $d^-(v) \geq 2$; therefore, D contains no 3^--vertices and every 4-vertex has $d^+(v) = d^-(v) = 2$.*

Proof. Suppose that a color $c \in L(v)$ does not appear among the outneighbors of v in an L-coloring of $D - v$. Then coloring v with c gives an L-coloring of D since a color-c cycle would have to use an outneighbor of v. The same contradiction is obtained if a color in $L(v)$ does not occur among the in-neighbors, and this completes the proof. □

Having an L-coloring ϕ of a subdigraph $D - u$ ($u \in V(D)$), we may consider coloring u with a color $i \in L(u)$. Since D is not L-colorable, this creates a color-i cycle, which we denote by $C_i = C_i(u)$. Such cycles will always be taken with respect to a partial coloring ϕ that will be clear from the context. If $L(u) = \{a, b\}$, then $C_a(u)$ and $C_b(u)$ are disjoint apart from their common vertex u. Since D is drawn in the plane, these cycles cannot cross each other at u, and we say that they *touch*.

Lemma 3.2. *Let v be a vertex incident to a triangle $T = vwu$, let ϕ be an L-coloring of $D - v$, and let $i \in L(v)$. Then $C_i(v)$ cannot contain both edges vu and vw.*

Proof. Since $C_i(v)$ is directed, we may assume that $uv, vw \in E(D)$. Since D has digirth greater than three, this implies that $uw \in E(D)$. But then we have a color-i cycle in $D - v$ consisting of the path $C_i(v) - v$ and the arc uw, a contradiction. □

Lemma 3.3. *Let v be a vertex incident to a 4-cycle $T = vwux$, let ϕ be an L-coloring of $D - v$ and let $i \in L(v)$. Then $C_i(v)$ cannot contain all three edges ux, xv and vw.*

Proof. Suppose that $C_i(v)$ contains the edges ux, xv and vw. Since $C_i(v)$ is directed, we may assume that $ux, xv, vw \in E(D)$. But this implies that $uw \in E(D)$, and we have a color-i cycle through the arc uw in $D - v$, a contradiction. □

The next lemma shows some restrictions on the colors around a 4-vertex that is contained in a triangle. Recall our assumption that $L(v) = \{1, 2\}$.

Lemma 3.4. *Let $T = vuw$ be a triangle in D and $deg(v) = 4$. Let ϕ be an L-coloring of $D - v$ such that $\phi(w) = 1$.*

(a) *The colors of the neighbors of v and the cycles $C_1(v)$ and $C_2(v)$ are as shown in Figure 6(a).*



Figure 6: Colors around a 4-vertex contained in a triangle

(b) *If $deg(w) = 4$, then $L(w) = L(v) = \{1, 2\}$ and the colors of the neighbors of v and w are as shown in Figure 6(b).*

(c) *If $deg(w) = 5$, the other face containing the edge vw is a 4-face, and the clockwise neighbors of w are v, u, w_1, w_2, w_3, then either (i) $w_1 \in V(C_1(v))$ and the colors of the neighbors of v and w are as shown in Figure 6(c_1), where d is the color in $L(w) \setminus \{1\}$), or (ii) $L(w) = L(v) = \{1, 2\}$, and the colors of the neighbors of v and w are as shown in Figure 6(c_2).*

Proof. (a) By assumption, $w \in V(C_1(v))$. By Lemma 3.2, $u \notin V(C_1(v))$. Since $C_1(v)$ and $C_2(v)$ touch at v, they must be as claimed.

(b) By uncoloring w and coloring v with color 1, we obtain an L-coloring ϕ' of $G - w$. The claim follows by applying part (a) to $D - w$ and ϕ'.

(c) By (a), colors around v are as claimed. By Lemma 3.3, the cycle $C_1(v)$ does not contain w_3. We are done if it contains w_1. Thus, we may assume that $C_1(v)$ contains w_2. Let us consider the coloring ϕ' of $D - w$ as used in the proof of part (b). Let $d \in L(w) \setminus \{1\}$. Clearly, $C_1(w) = C_1(v)$. Since $C_d(w)$ and $C_1(w)$ touch at w, the cycle $C_d(w)$ contains the edges uw and ww_1. Since $\phi(u) = 2$, we have $d = 2$ and the coloring is as shown in Figure 6(c_2). □

Let $Q_1, \ldots, Q_{25}$ be the configurations shown in Figures 1–4. Our goal is to prove that each of these configurations is reducible. We will use the notation about vertices of each of these configurations as depicted in Figures 1–4 and in additional figures in this section.

Lemma 3.5. *Configurations Q_1, Q_2, and Q_3 are reducible.*

Proof. Let ϕ be an L-coloring of $D - v$. By Lemma 3.4(a), the cycle $C_1(v)$ in Q_1 uses the edges vv_2 and vv_3, a contradiction to Lemma 3.2. Similarly, Lemma 3.4(b) yields a contradiction to Lemma 3.3 in the case of Q_2. For Q_3, we apply Lemma 3.4(b) at each of the vertices v, w, u and conclude that changing $\phi(w)$ to 2 and $\phi(u)$ to 1 gives an L-coloring of $D - v$ that contradicts Lemma 3.4(a). □

Lemma 3.6. *Configurations Q_4 and Q_5 are reducible.*

Proof. We may assume that $vv_3 \in E(D)$. Let ϕ be an L-coloring of $D - vv_3$. Clearly, we may assume that $\phi(v) = \phi(v_3) = 1$ for otherwise ϕ is an L-coloring of D. The cycle $C = C_1(v)$ uses the arc vv_3. By Lemma 3.2, C cannot use the arcs v_2v or v_4v. Therefore, we may

assume that C uses the arcs v_1v and vv_3. Since C and the cycle $C' = C_2(v)$ touch at v, C' uses the edges v_4v and vv_5. In Q_4, this yields a contradiction by Lemma 3.2. So, it remains to consider Q_5.

Let $u \neq v$ be the neighbor of v_1 on C and $w \neq v$ be the neighbor of v_5 on C'. Now, since D is not L-colorable and $\deg(v_1) = 4$, if we were to recolor v_1 with color $c \in L(v_1)\setminus\{1\}$ (and keep color 1 at v), we must have $c = 2$ and obtain a color-2 cycle C'' through v_1. Clearly, C'' uses the edge v_1v_5. By Lemma 3.4(a) applied at the vertex v_5, C'' must use the edge wv_5. Now, modifying ϕ by recoloring v_5 with the color $d \in L(v_5) \setminus \{2\}$ and v with 2, we note that there cannot be a color-2 cycle through v nor a color-d cycle through v_5 since the only possibility for such a cycle is when $d = 1$ and $C' \cup C''$ separates the vertex u from possible neighbor of v_5 of color 1 that is different from v_1. Thus, we obtain an L-coloring of D, a contradiction. □



Figure 7: Triangle $T = vuw$ and its neighborhood

In the proofs of all of the subsequent lemmas, showing reducibility of particular configurations, we have a common scenario. Let us describe the common notation and assumptions that we will inquire.

We will always have a triangle $T = vuw$, where $\deg(v) = 4$. We shall assume that $L(v) = \{1, 2\}$ and will consider an L-coloring ϕ of $D - v$. This coloring will also be denoted by ϕ_v if we would want to remind the reader that the vertex v is not colored. The neighbors of the vertices of T are denoted as in Figure 7(a), v_1, v_2 being neighbors of v, $u_1, \ldots, u_s$ neighbors of u and $w_1, \ldots, w_t$ neighbors of w, where u_i and w_j are enumerated in the clockwise order. It may be that $u_s = w_1$. By Lemma 3.4(a), we may assume that $\phi_v(v_2) = \phi_v(w) = 1$ and $\phi_v(v_1) = \phi_v(u) = 2$. We shall denote the unused colors in $L(u)$ and $L(w)$ by c and d, respectively, i.e., $c \in L(u) \setminus \{2\}$ and $d \in L(w) \setminus \{1\}$. Sometimes we shall be able to conclude that $c = 1$ or that $d = 2$, but in general this needs not to be the case.

As discussed before, there are two cycles $C_1(v)$ and $C_2(v)$ passing through v. Similar cycles can be defined for u and w. First we define an L-coloring ϕ_u of $D - u$ by modifying ϕ_v by coloring v with color 2 and uncolor u. This coloring defines cycles $C_2(u)$ and $C_c(u)$ that touch at u. Note that we may assume that $C_2(u) = C_2(v)$. Similarly, by coloring v with color 1 and uncolor w, we obtain a coloring ϕ_w of $D - w$. The corresponding cycles $C_1(w)$ and $C_d(w)$ touch at w. Note that $C_1(w) = C_1(v)$. This situation is depicted in in Figure 7(b), where the touching of the cycles at u and w may be different than shown (e.g., the

cycle $C_c(u)$ could be in the exterior of $C_2(u)$). Note that if $c = 1$ and $d = 2$, it may happen that $C_c(u)$ and $C_d(w)$ share the edge uw (but they would be disjoint elsewhere since $c \neq d$ in this case).



Figure 8: Configurations Q_6 to Q_9

Lemma 3.7. *Configurations Q_6, Q_7, Q_8, and Q_9 are reducible.*

Proof. We shall use additional notation depicted in Figure 8. We first assume that $C_1(v)$ uses the edge ww_2, and consider the cycle $C_d(w)$. Since $C_1(v)$ and $C_d(w)$ touch at w, $C_d(w)$ uses edges wu and ww_1. In particular, this implies that $d = 2$ since $\phi_w(u) = 2$. Note that this cannot happen in Q_6 by Lemma 3.2, so we may assume to have one of the configurations Q_7–Q_9. Let us now consider the cycle $C_2(v)$. By Lemma 3.3, $C_2(v)$ uses the edge u_2u or u_3u. If $C_2(v)$ uses the edge u_2u, the cycle $C_c(u)$ must use the edges uw and uu_3. In particular, we have $c = 1$. Now we recolor u with color 1 and w with color $d = 2$. It is clear that there is no color-1 cycle through u and there is no color-d cycle through w (since it would need to touch $C_1(w)$). It follows that the modified coloring ϕ' is a proper L-coloring of $D - v$ with the property that $\phi'(v_1) \neq \phi'(u)$, contradicting Lemma 3.4.

Thus, we may assume that $C_2(v)$ uses the edge u_3u, so $\phi_w(u_3) = \phi_v(u_3) = 2$. The cycle $C_d(w)$ uses the edges uw and ww_1, and hence we have $d = 2$. Let us change ϕ_v to a coloring ϕ'_v of $D-v$ by recoloring u with color c and w with color 2. A color-2 cycle through w would touch $C_1(v)$ at the vertex w, and clearly, there is no room for this, so there is no such cycle. By Lemma 3.2, there is no color-c cycle through u in Q_7 or Q_9. Therefore, the modified coloring ϕ'_v is a proper L-coloring of $D - v$ for configurations Q_7 and Q_9. Now, Lemma 3.4 yields a contradiction in these two cases.

It remains to consider the configuration Q_8. If there were no color-c cycle through u, we would have a contradiction as above. Therefore, $\phi(u_1) = \phi(u_2) = c$ and there is a color-c cycle C' using the edges u_1u and uu_2. Now we modify the original coloring ϕ as follows. We uncolor u_3 and color v with color 2. Clearly, this gives an L-coloring ϕ' of $D - u_3$. By Lemma 3.4(b), we conclude that $L(u_3) = L(u_2) = \{2, c\}$ and that u_2 has a neighbor of color 2 that is contained in the interior of the cycle C'. Now, we change ϕ' by coloring u_3 with color c and u_2 with color 2. By the above, it is easy to see that we obtain an L-coloring of D, a contradiction.

Thus, it remains to consider the case that $C_1(v)$ does not use the edge w_2w. By Lemma 3.4(b), this case cannot occur for the configurations Q_8 and Q_9. For the configurations Q_6

and Q_7, $C_1(v)$ necessarily uses the edge w_1w by Lemma 3.4(c). The cycle $C_d(w)$ must use edges ww_2 and ww_3, thus $\phi(w_2) = \phi(w_3) = d$. Now, consider $C_2(v)$. By Lemma 3.3, $C_2(v)$ cannot use the edge u_1u. Assume that $C_2(v)$ uses the edge u_2u. Then $C_c(u)$ must use the edges u_3u and uw in Q_6, and the edges u_3u, uw and ww_1 in Q_7. This contradicts Lemmas 3.2 and 3.3, respectively. This settles the reducibility of Q_6.

For Q_7, assume finally that $C_2(v)$ uses the edge u_3u. Now, $C_c(u)$ must use both edges uu_1 and uu_2, which contradicts Lemma 3.4. Hence, Q_7 is also reducible. This completes the proof. □



Figure 9: Configurations Q_{10}, Q_{11}, and Q_{12}

Lemma 3.8. *Configurations Q_{10}, Q_{11}, and Q_{12} are reducible.*

Proof. We shall use additional notation depicted in Figure 9. By Lemma 3.4 we see that $L(w) = \{1, 2\}$. Let $C = C_2(v)$. We may assume that C contains the directed arcs uv and vv_1. The cycle C must use one of the arcs u_1u, u_2u, u_3u, or u_4u. By Lemma 3.3, C cannot use the arc u_4u. Next, suppose that C uses the arc u_2u. Now, we claim that modifying ϕ_v by recoloring u with color $c \in L(u) \setminus \{2\}$ and w with color 2, gives an L-coloring of $D - v$. Clearly, there is no color-2 cycle through w since w has only one neighbor of color 2. Now, a color-c cycle C' through u touches C, so it uses the arcs u_3u and uu_4, contradicting Lemma 3.2. Therefore, the modified coloring is an L-coloring of $D - v$, and Lemma 3.4 now implies that we can extend it to an L-coloring of D.

Now, suppose that C uses the arc u_1u. Now, if we were to modify ϕ_v by recoloring u with color c and w with color 2, by Lemma 3.4 this cannot be an L-coloring of $D - v$, thus we must have a color-c cycle C' through u. By Lemma 3.2, C' either uses the edges u_2u and u_4u or (in Q_{11} only) uses the edges u_2u and uu_3. Suppose first that C' uses the edges u_2u and uu_4. This cannot happen in Q_{12} since it would contradict Lemma 3.4(a) at the vertex u_4 because in this case C' would have to use the edge u_4x. Now, consider the cycle $C'' = C_2(w)$ through w in the coloring ϕ_w. Then C'' must use the arcs u_1u, uw and ww_1. This contradicts Lemma 3.3 in cases Q_{10} and Q_{11}. The remaining case is that C' uses edges u_2u and uu_3, which can happen only in Q_{11} (by Lemma 3.3). The cycle $C_2(w)$, which uses edges w_1w and wu, cannot use u_1u by Lemma 3.3, so it must use the edge uu_4.

Next, we distinguish two cases. First, assume that $u_4u, uw, ww_1 \in E(D)$. Then $u_4v_1 \in E(D)$. Clearly, $C_2(w)$ uses a vertex $x \neq u$ on C (since C and $C_2(w)$ cross at u). But now, the directed path from v_1 to x on C, together with the arc u_4v_1 and the path from x to u_4 on $C_2(w)$ create a directed color-2 closed walk in the original coloring ϕ, a contradiction. Secondly, assume that $uu_4, wu, w_1w \in E(D)$. Clearly, $C_2(w)$ uses a vertex $y \neq u$ on C. But now, the directed path from y to u_1 on C, with the arcs u_1u, uu_4 and the directed path from u_4 to y on $C_2(w)$ creates a color-2 directed closed walk in the original coloring ϕ, a contradiction.

It remains to consider the case when C uses the arc u_3u. Now, if we were to modify ϕ by recoloring u with color c and w with color 2, then Lemma 3.4 would imply that this is not an L-coloring of $D - v$. Since there cannot be a color-2 cycle through w, this implies that there is a color-c cycle C' through u. Since C and C' touch, C' must use the edges u_2u and uu_1, and hence $\phi(u_1) = \phi(u_2) = c$. By Lemma 3.2, this is not possible in Q_{11} and Q_{12}, so we are in Q_{10}. Since C' is a directed cycle, assume that we have the arcs u_2u and uu_1 (similar argument works for the other possibility). Now, C' cannot use the arc xu_2 by Lemma 3.3. Therefore, C' uses the arc yu_2. Now, modify ϕ by recoloring u with color c, w with color 2, color v with color 1, and uncolor u_2. The resulting coloring of $D - u_2$ contradicts Lemma 3.4(a). This completes the proof. □



Figure 10: Configurations Q_{13}, Q_{14}, and Q_{15}

Lemma 3.9. *Configurations Q_{13}, Q_{14} and Q_{15} are reducible.*

Proof. The cycle $C_2(v)$ uses the edges uv and vv_1 and we may assume $uv, vv_1 \in E(D)$. By Lemma 3.3, $C_2(v)$ cannot use the edge u_1u. If $C_2(v)$ uses the edge u_2u, then $C_c(u)$ uses the edges u_3u and uw, contradicting Lemma 3.2. Therefore, we may assume henceforth that $C_2(v)$ uses the edge u_3u and that, in particular, $\phi(u_3) = 2$. Therefore, the cycle $C_c(u)$ uses the edges u_1u and uu_2, and we have that $\phi_v(u_1) = \phi_v(u_2) = c$.

The cycle $C'' = C_d(w)$ uses two of the incident arcs to w. Since two neighbors of w are on $C_1(v)$ and u, u_3 are on $C_2(v)$, we conclude that $d = 2$. Clearly, by Lemma 3.2, C'' cannot use both of the edges wu_3 and uw. Since $C_1(v)$ and C'' touch at w, $C_1(v)$ contains w_3 and C'' contains the edge ww_2.

Note that $u_3 \in V(C'')$, since u_3 is the only neighbor of u of color 2 in the coloring ϕ_w. Let us first suppose that C'' contains the arc uw. Since D has no directed triangles, we conclude that $u_3w \in E(D)$, so we may shorten C'' by eliminating vertex u, and thus we may henceforth assume that C'' contains the edge u_3w. Now, Lemma 3.2 yields a contradiction in the case of the configuration Q_{15}. So, we are left to consider Q_{13} and Q_{14}.

Suppose that $\phi_v(x) = 2$, where x is the neighbor of u_3 as shown in the figure. Then we modify the original coloring ϕ as follows: we recolor u_3 with the color $c' \in L(u_3) \setminus \{2\}$, recolor w with color 2, and color v with color 1. We claim that this is an L-coloring of D. Clearly, there is no color-1 cycle through v since v_2 is the only neighbor of v with color 1. Similarly, there is no color-2 cycle through w since u has no neighbor of color 2. Lastly, there is no color-c' cycle through u_3, since such a cycle would need to use the edges u_3u_2 and u_3y, thus it would not touch C''. This contradiction shows that $C_2(v)$ and C'' use the edge yu_3, and consequently, $\phi(y) = 2$. In particular, the cycle $C'' = C_2(w)$ uses the edges yu_3, u_3w, and ww_2. Lemma 3.3 yields contradiction in the case of the configuration Q_{14}.

It remains to consider Q_{13}. First, we observe that the color-c cycle $C' = C_c(u)$ mentioned above uses the edge u_2s. (This follows by Lemma 3.4(a) applied to the coloring of $D - u_2$ obtained in this case.) Therefore, $\phi(s) = c$ and $\phi(t) = \phi(u_3) = 2$.

Now, if we were to modify the original coloring ϕ by recoloring u_3 with the color c', we would obtain a color-c' cycle Q through u_3 for otherwise coloring v with color 2 would give a proper L-coloring of D. Clearly, Q and $C_2(v)$ touch at u_3, so Q uses edges u_2u_3 and u_3x. In particular, we have $c = c'$. But now we can recolor u_2 with the color $c'' \in L(u_2) \setminus \{c\}$, v with color 2 and obtain an L-coloring of D. This contradiction completes the proof. □



Figure 11: Configurations Q_{16}, Q_{17}, and Q_{18}

Lemma 3.10. *The configurations Q_{16}, Q_{17}, Q_{18} are reducible.*

Proof. We may assume $uv, vv_1 \in E(D)$. By Lemma 3.3, $C_2(v)$ cannot use the edge u_1u. Therefore, $C_2(v)$ uses one of the edges u_2u and u_3u.

Let us first assume that $C_2(v)$ uses the edge u_3u. Then the cycle $C_c(u)$ uses edges u_1u and uu_2. Lemma 3.2 gives a contradiction in the case of configurations Q_{16} and Q_{17}, so it remains to consider Q_{18}. Let us now modify ϕ_v as follows: color v with color 2 and

uncolor u_3. Clearly, this is a proper L-coloring of $D - u_3$. Thus, Lemma 3.4(a) implies that $\phi_v(w_1) = \phi_v(u) = 2$, and that $\phi_v(x) = \phi_v(u_2) = c$.

Now, we consider the cycle $C'' = C_2(w)$. Since C'' and $C_1(w)$ touch at w, C'' cannot use the edge ww_3. By Lemma 3.2, C'' cannot use both edges w_1w and ww_2. Similarly, C'' cannot use both, uw and ww_1, since in that case C'' would also use u_3u, contradicting Lemma 3.3. The only possibility left is that C'' uses the edges uw and ww_2. This implies that C'' uses the arcs w_1u_3, u_3u, uw, and ww_2. Consequently, $w_1w \in E(D)$. Since D has no directed triangles, it follows that $w_1w_2 \in E(D)$. Let P be the directed path on C'' from w_2 to w_1. But now the directed closed walk w_1w_2P contains a color-2 cycle in the original coloring ϕ_v, a contradiction. This completes the proof when u_3u belongs to $C_2(v)$.

Suppose now that $C_2(v)$ uses the edge u_2u. Then the cycle $C' = C_c(u)$ uses the edges u_3u and uw. Note that this implies in particular that $c = 1$. By Lemma 3.3, C' cannot use the edge ww_1. Thus, we have two possibilities: C' uses the edge ww_2 or ww_3.

In either case, we modify the original coloring ϕ_v by recoloring u with color $c = 1$, coloring v with color 2, and uncoloring w. We now consider the cycles $C_1(w)$ and $C_d(w)$ with respect to this coloring of $D - w$. Clearly, $C' = C_1(w)$. The cycle $C'' = C_d(w)$ touches C' at w. If C' used the edge ww_2, then $C_d(w)$ would have to use edges ww_3, wv and vv_1, which is not possible since it would need to cross the color-1 cycle $C_1(v)$. Thus, C' uses the edge ww_3, and C'' uses the edges w_1w and ww_2. In cases Q_{16} and Q_{18} we have a contradiction to Lemma 3.2. This completes the proof for Q_{16} and Q_{18}.

It remains to consider Q_{17}. Recall that C' uses the edge ww_3. Note that C' cannot use the edge w_3x since then we could modify the original coloring ϕ by recoloring u with color 1, w_3 with color $d' \in L(w_3) \setminus \{1\}$, and coloring v with color 2, obtaining a proper L-coloring of D. Therefore, C' uses the edge w_3y and, consequently, $\phi(w_3) = \phi(y) = 1$. Since w_1, w_2 belong to $C'' = C_d(w)$, we have $\phi(w_1) = \phi(w_2) = d$. Now, C'' uses the edge w_2s (by Lemma 3.4(b)). In particular, we have $\phi(s) = d$, and consequently, $\phi(t) = 1$.

Now, we modify the original coloring ϕ by recoloring u with color 1 and w_3 with color d'. Since this is not a proper L-coloring of $D - v$, it follows that there is a color-d' cycle C''' through w_3. Clearly, C''' must use the edges sw_2, w_2w_3 and w_3x, separating t from w. Now, recoloring w_2 with color 1 and coloring v with color 2, we obtain a proper L-coloring of D. This final contradiction shows that Q_{17} is reducible. □



Figure 12: Configurations Q_{19} and Q_{20}

Lemma 3.11. *The configurations Q_{19} and Q_{20} are reducible.*

Proof. We may assume that $uv, vv_1 \in E(D)$. The cycle $C_2(v)$ cannot use the edge u_1u by Lemma 3.3. Therefore, $C_2(v)$ must use one of the edges u_2u or u_3u. If $C_2(v)$ uses the edge u_3u, then $C_c(u)$ would use edges u_1u and uu_2, a contradiction to Lemma 3.2. Thus, $C_2(v)$ uses the edge u_2u. The cycles $C_c(u)$ and $C_2(v)$ touch at u; thus $C_c(u)$ must use the edges uw and uu_3. This implies that $c = 1$. Let us now consider the cycle $C_1(v)$. Clearly, it contains the edges wv and vv_2, and does not contain the edge w_3w by Lemma 3.3. Therefore, $C_1(v)$ uses one of the edges, w_1w or w_2w.

If $C_1(v)$ uses the edge w_2w, then $C_d(w)$ must use the edges wu and ww_1. Since $\phi_w(u) = 2$, we have $d = 2$ and $\phi(w_1) = 2$. Observe that the cycles $C_1(u)$ and $C_2(w)$ share the edge uw, but are otherwise disjoint. However, this is not possible, since they "cross each other" when viewed how they leave the edge uw at one and the other end. This contradiction shows that $C_1(v)$ uses the edge w_1w. Consequently, we have $\phi(w_1) = 1$. Then $C_d(w)$ contains the edges ww_3 and ww_2. This contradicts Lemma 3.2 for configuration Q_{20}.

It remains to consider Q_{19}. As mentioned above, $C_1(v)$ uses the edge w_1w. If $C_1(v)$ uses the edge tw_1, we modify the original coloring ϕ by coloring v with color 1 and uncoloring w_1. Clearly, this modified coloring is a proper L-coloring of $D - w_1$. But now, Lemma 3.4(a) yields a contradiction. Hence, we may assume that $C_1(v)$ uses the edge sw_1 and consequently $\phi(s) = 1$. Now, if were to modify the original coloring ϕ by coloring v with color 1, recoloring w with color d, and uncoloring w_2, we would obtain a proper L-coloring of $D - w_2$. By Lemma 3.4(a), it follows that $L(w_2) = \{1, d\}$ and that $\phi_v(y) = d$ and $\phi_v(x) = 1$.

Now, we modify the original coloring ϕ_v as follows: we color v with color 1, recolor w with color d, recolor w_2 with color 1 and uncolor w_1. Since $C_1(v)$ separates u from w_3 there is no color-d cycle through w. It is easy to see that there are no monochromatic cycles through v or w_2. Therefore, the modified coloring is a proper L-coloring of $D - w_1$. But now, Lemma 3.4 implies that $\phi(s) = d$, a contradiction. Therefore, Q_{19} is also reducible. □



Figure 13: Configurations Q_{21}, Q_{22}, and Q_{23}

Lemma 3.12. *The configurations Q_{21}, Q_{22} and Q_{23} are reducible.*

Proof. Consider the cycle $C_1(v)$. It uses the edges wv and vv_2. By Lemma 3.3, $C_1(v)$ cannot use the edge w_2w. If $C_1(v)$ uses the arc w_1w, then $C_d(w)$ would use edges uw and wu_4,

and Lemma 3.2 would yield a contradiction. This proves that $C_1(v)$ uses the arc u_4w. Now we see that the cycle $C_d(w)$ uses the edges w_1w and ww_2, and thus $\phi_v(w_1) = \phi_v(w_2) = d$. Lemma 3.2 gives a contradiction in the case of Q_{21}, so it remains to consider Q_{22} and Q_{23}.

The cycle $C_2(v)$ uses the edges uv and vv_1. By Lemma 3.3, it cannot use the edge u_1u. Since $\phi_v(u_4) = 1$, $C_2(v)$ uses one of the edges u_2u or u_3u. If $C_2(v)$ uses the edge u_3u, consider the cycle $C_c(u)$. It cannot use the edges u_1u and uu_2, since this would contradict Lemma 3.2. Similarly, it cannot use the edges uw and uu_4. This shows that $C_2(v)$ cannot use the edge u_3u.

We conclude from the above that $C_2(v)$ uses the edge u_2u. The cycles $C_2(u) = C_2(v)$ and $C' = C_c(u)$ touch at u. Therefore, C' uses two of the edges uu_3, uu_4, uw, and in particular we have $c = 1$ since $\phi_u(w) = \phi_u(u_4) = 1$.

In Q_{22}, C' cannot use both of the edges u_3u and uu_4 by Lemma 3.2. Similarly, C' cannot use both of the edges u_4u and uw. Therefore, we may assume that C' uses the edges u_3u and uw. But then, C' necessarily uses the edges wu_4 since $\phi_u(w_1) = \phi_u(w_2) = d$ and $\phi_u(v) = 2$. Since we may assume that u_3uwu_4 is a directed path, we get a contradiction with Lemma 3.3.

It remains to consider Q_{23}. Recall that $C_2(v)$ uses the edge u_2u, and also note that $C_1(v)$ uses one of the arcs yu_4 or xu_4. First, suppose that $C_1(v)$ uses the arc yu_4 so that $\phi_v(y) = 1$. Now, we modify the coloring ϕ_u by recoloring u_4 with color $d' \in L(u_4) \setminus \{1\}$ and coloring u with color 1. Now, since $C_1(v)$ separates x from w_1, there is no color-d' cycle through u_4 in the modified coloring. Similarly, since $C_2(v)$ separates u_1 from u_3 and since $\phi_u(w_1) = \phi_u(w_2) = d$, there is no color-1 cycle through u in the modified coloring. This shows that we have a proper L-coloring of D, a contradiction.

Thus, we may assume that $C_1(v)$ uses the arc xu_4, and consequently, $\phi_v(x) = 1$. Now, we claim that $\phi_v(y) = d$. If not, then by the argument above we could modify ϕ_u by recoloring u_4 with color d' and coloring u with color 1, obtaining a proper L-coloring of D unless $d' = d$ and there is a color-d cycle using edges yu_4 and u_4w_1. This proves our claim that $\phi_v(y) = d$.

Now, we again consider the cycle $C' = C_c(u)$ (recalling that $c = 1$ and that C' uses two of the three edges u_3u, u_4u and wu at the vertex u. If C' uses the edges u_3u and uu_4, then since $\phi_v(w_1) = \phi_v(w_2) = \phi_v(y) = d$, C' must also use the edge u_4x, contradicting Lemma 3.3. Clearly, by Lemma 3.2, C' cannot use both of the edges u_4u and uw. Therefore, it remains to consider the case that C' uses the edges u_3u and uw. But then, C' necessarily uses the edges wu_4 and u_4x. Since D has no directed triangles, it follows that u_3uu_4x is a directed path of color 1, implying that there was a color-1 cycle through the edge u_3x in the original coloring ϕ, a contradiction. This completes the proof of reducibility of Q_{23}. □

Lemma 3.13. *The configurations Q_{24} and Q_{25} are reducible.*

Proof. The cycle $C = C_1(v)$ uses the edges wv and vv_2. By Lemma 3.3, C cannot use the edge w_2w. If C uses the edge ww_1, then the cycle $C_d(w)$, which touches C at w, has to use the edges uw and wu_4. However, this contradicts Lemma 3.2. Therefore, C uses the arc u_4w and $\phi(u_4) = 1$. Now, consider ϕ_w. Clearly, $C_d(w)$ uses the edges ww_1 and ww_2. It follows that $\phi_v(w_1) = \phi_v(w_2) = d$. Hence, since $d \neq 1$, C cannot use the edge u_4w_1.



Figure 14: Configurations Q_{24} and Q_{25}

Now, consider the cycle $C' = C_2(v)$. Since C' uses the edges uv and vv_1, it cannot use the edge u_1u by Lemma 3.3. Since $\phi(u_4) = 1$, C' must use one of the edges u_2u or u_3u. If C' uses the edge u_3u, consider the coloring ϕ_u and the cycle $C_c(u)$. This cycle touches $C_2(u)$ at u. By Lemma 3.2, it can neither use the edges uu_1 and uu_2 nor the edges u_4u and uw. This contradiction proves that C' uses the edge u_2u. The cycle $C_c(u)$, which touches C' at u, must use the edge u_3u. Since $\phi_u(w) = \phi_u(u_4) = 1$, we have $c = 1$. Also note that $\phi_u(v) = 2$; thus, if $C_c(u)$ uses the edge uw, then it also uses the edge wu_4, and we can replace the cycle by a shorter color-1 cycle by using the edge uu_4 instead of uw and wu_4. (The orientation of the path uwu_4 is the same as uu_4 since D has no directed 3-cycles.) Thus, we may assume that $C_c(u)$ contains the edge uu_4. By Lemma 3.3, $C_c(u)$ cannot use the edge u_3x, so it must use the edge u_3y (or u_3z).

Let us now consider Q_{24}. Changing ϕ_u by uncoloring u_3 and coloring u with color 1, we obtain an L-coloring of $D - u_3$. This coloring is in contradiction with Lemma 3.4(a) at the vertex u_3, so this concludes the proof for Q_{24}.

It remains to show reducibility of Q_{25}. Let us recall that C' uses the edge u_2u. If C' used the edge u_2u_1, then we could replace its edges uu_2 and u_2u_1 by the edge uu_1, and this would lead to a contradiction to Lemma 3.3. Clearly, C' cannot use the edge u_2u_3 (since $\phi_u(u_3) = 1$), so it either uses the edge u_2t or u_2z.

First, assume that C' uses the edge u_2t. Now, we modify the coloring ϕ_v by recoloring u_2 with color $d' \in L(u_2)\backslash\{2\}$, and coloring v with color 2. Since we previously showed that any color-2 cycle through v must use the edge u_2u, it follows that there is no color-2 cycle through v. Since D is not L-colorable, it follows that there is a color-d' cycle $C'' = C_{d'}(u_2)$ through u_2. Since C' and C'' touch at u_2, it follows that C'' contains the edges zu_2 and u_2u_3, contradicting Lemma 3.2.

Finally, assume that C' uses the edge zu_2. Now, extend the original coloring ϕ by coloring v with color 2 and recoloring u_2 by the color $d' \in L(u_2)\backslash\{2\}$. This yields a color-$d'$ cycle $C_{d'}(u_2)$ which touches C' at u_2 and thus uses the edges tu_2, u_2u_1, and u_1s. It follows that $\phi(u_1) = \phi(t) = \phi(s) = d'$. Now, recoloring u_1 with color $c' \in L(u_1)\backslash\{d'\}$, we get a proper L-coloring of D (by using Lemma 3.3). This final contradiction shows that Q_{25} is

reducible. □

We are ready to complete the proof of the main result.

Proof of Theorem 1.3. By Theorem 2.1, every planar graph of minimum degree at least four contains one of the configurations $Q_1, \ldots, Q_{25}$. Suppose that D is a minimum counterexample to Theorem 1.3. Then D has digirth at least five and minimum degree at least four, but cannot contain any of the configurations $Q_1, \ldots, Q_{25}$ by Lemmas 3.5-3.13. This proves that a counterexample does not exist, and the proof is complete. □

4 Concluding remarks

We raise the following questions. It would be interesting to see if the result can be pushed to digirth 4. Also, the following relaxation of Conjecture 1.1 should be of interest.

Conjecture 4.1. *There exists k such that every simple planar digraph without cycles of length $4, \ldots, k$ is 2-colorable.*

The original conjecture still seems out of reach. In fact, we do not know of a simple proof of the fact that planar digraphs of large digirth are 2-colorable. In support of the conjecture, it would be nice to see whether one can find large acyclic set in a planar digraph, say of size $n/2$. In fact, the following was conjectured in [3].

Conjecture 4.2. *Every simple n-vertex planar digraph has an acyclic set of size at least $\frac{3n}{5}$.*

It is known that the bound in Conjecture 4.2 cannot be replaced by any larger value.

References

[1] D. Bokal, G. Fijavž, M. Juvan, P. M. Kayll, B. Mohar, The circular chromatic number of a digraph, J. Graph Theory 46 (2004), 227–240.

[2] G. Chartrand, H.V. Kronk, C.E. Wall, The point-arboricity of a graph, Israel J. Math. 6 (1968), 169–175.

[3] A. Harutyunyan, Brooks-type results for coloring of digraphs, PhD Thesis, Simon Fraser University, 2011.

[4] V. Neumann-Lara, The dichromatic number of a digraph, J. Combin. Theory, Ser. B 33 (1982), 265–270.

[5] V. Neumann-Lara, Vertex colourings in digraphs. Some Problems. Seminar notes, University of Waterloo, July 8, 1985 (communicated by A. Bondy and S. Thomassé).